(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ಕಂಠಿ)

Of course, the Governor is going to make the appointment. But to say that the Assembly is not complete unless the nomination is made from the Anglo-Indian Community is not correct. There are vacancies in the House. It may not have been filled up for some reason. Then it does not mean that the House is incomplete. However, a decision is going to be taken very shortly and I hope a quietus will be given to the question raised by the Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members have heard the explanation rendered by the Hon'ble Chief Minister. One thing I want to tell Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa. I do not know whether he remembered only last night of the incompleteness of the House, or whether he was all along aware of the incompleteness of the House without the Anglo-Indian member, and still transact the business of the House. I am unable to understand. Therefore I think he seems to be more in jest rather in earnest.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I thought till yesterday that there was an Anglo-Indian representative.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Whom did you have in mind?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—So many new members are there in the House. You yourself do not know who is who. I thought the Anglo-Indian representative was here.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I understand the *bona fide* mistake of the Hon'ble Member. But it does not alter the legal position.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I do not think that Sri Muckannappa is so innocent of that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The business of the House will now proceed.

Point of Order *re*: Election of Deputy Speaker.

†Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—On a point of order, Sir.

Sir, the motion that has been asked to be moved is regarding the election of the Deputy Speaker of this Hon'ble House. The matter was once before this House, I think, on the 25th, and as the proposer and the seconder from the ruling party were absent, the motion was lost. Another motion from this side was moved in this House and this House has given a decision on that particular motion. I should like to submit that rule 274, sub-clause (2) of the Rules of Procedure says:

> "If the member when called on is absent, any other member authorised by him in writing in this behalf, may, with the permission of the Speaker, move the motion standing in his name. Such permission shall not be granted in the case of a statutory motion or motions relating to Bills.....If no member has been so authorised, or such permission is not granted, the motion, other than a motion relating to a Bill to which the provisions of rule apply, shall lapse."

The wording is "shall lapse". What is the meaning of the word "lapse"? I have referred the dictionary and found out the following meaning. Lapse means under law the termination of the right or privilege; to neglect to exercise it within the limit of time or to fail under some contingency. It means to forfeit and to lose. These are the legal meanings of the word lapse. Then, I should like to refer you to rule 271 of the Rules of Procedure.

> "A motion must not raise a question substantilally identical with one on which the Assembly has given a decision in the same session."

Then again, I should like to refer to rule 144 "Repetition of resolution".

> "(1) When a resolution has been moved and voted upon no resolution or amendment raising substantially the same question shall be moved within one year from the date of moving of the earlier resolution.
>
> (2) When a resolution has been withdrawn with the leave of

the Assembly, no resolution raising substantially the same question shall be moved during the same session."

Again, I should like to read rule 148 sub-clause (6):

"(vi) it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session."

The matter has been discussed in the same session. As regards your power under Rule 149, *viz.*, "the Speaker shall decide whether a motion or a part thereof is or is not admissible under these rules and may disallow any motion or a part thereof when in his opinion it is an abuse of the right of moving a motion or calculated to obstruct or prejudicially affect the procedure of the Assembly or in contravention of these rules", the discretion given to you is restricted by this particular rule. As I have pointed out, under these various rules, the motion that is now being moved before this House is similar to the one that has already been considered and decided by this House and this House is of the firm opinion that there should be no fresh discussion at all. So I submit that it has already been discussed. Secondly when the ruling party is so callous in its duties, so negligent in its duties . .

(*Interruptions*)

.....that they do not understand their own responsibilities that have been cast upon them. It is really surprising, Sir, that not a single member from the ruling party rose at that time and asked for adjournment at least of the election of the Deputy Speaker. If they had asked for an adjournment, the subject could have been taken up subsequently. But even that was not done by the ruling party. So, I say that it is not even within your power to allow this motion to be moved in this House in this Session.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I am afraid that the Hon'ble Member is trying to quote against himself. In a matte, which has been discussed in this House. it is true that it cannot be raised again-

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—In the same session.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—In the same session. But what was discussed in this House? It was the motion that Sri Peeranna should be elected as the Deputy Speaker was discussed. The other resolution, the motion made by the Hon'ble Member here to the effect that Sri Panchagavi should be Deputy Speaker, has not been discussed at all. So the question does not arise. That is why I said that the Hon'ble Member Opposite was quoting the Bible against himself.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—What about the word 'lapse'?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—As regards the question of lapse, it is for the Hon'ble Speaker to decide whether he can admit it or not. You have got a fresh notice and you have admitted it. This is a matter which has not been discussed in this House that Sri Panchagavi should be elected as Deputy Speaker of this House has not been discussed. You have been kind enough to admit the motion. Therefore, the questioning of your authority does not arise at all.

(*Sri A. Krishna Shetti rose*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is not going to be a debate on this point.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಮಂಗಳೂರು II).—ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಹೊಸ ವಿಷಯವಲ್ಲ.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are entering into a discussion. There is no motion before the House. He has only raised a point. If you want to say anything about it, you should be brief.

Sri A. KRISHNA SHETTY.—On a point of order. ಕಳಿದ ಸಾರಿ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಉಪೇಂದ್ರುವಾರರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರು. ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಉಪೇಂದ್ರುವಾರರು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವಾಗ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಉಪೇಂದ್ರುವಾರರು ಇರಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಆಗ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದ ಶ್ರೀ ಪೀರಣ್ಣನವರ ಹೆಸರು ಮಾತ್ರ ಸೂಚಿತವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ದಿನ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಅವರನ್ನು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What was the Hon'ble member doing at that time? Why did he not suggest that idea at that time?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಕೃಷ್ಣ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ಆಗ ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಜ್ಞಾಪಕಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH (Koratagere).—The Hon'ble Member referred to rule 148 (6).

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I rise to a point of order. Can any member cross between a member who is on his legs and the Speaker ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Patil has raised a very important point. I have been observing for the last few days that several members, perhaps through ignorance, have been moving about in the House in a manner that they cross between the member on his legs addressing the House and the Speaker. That is not proper. Always in such cases what I have been doing is to ring the bell and on one or two occasions I indicated by signs. 'Please do not do so'. The Minister for Home committed a little breach by crossing between thr member on his legs and the Speakee and that is why Sri Patil has raised this point. I am sure, it will not happen again.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMAIAH.—Sir, I refer to rule 148. My friend referred to sub-rule (6) but forgot to refer to sub-rule (4) which says that "it shall be restricted to a matter of recent occurrence."

‡Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Speaker is well aware whether it is to be admitted or not. My friend is beating the dead horse. Why should my friend Sri Chennigaramaiah try to teach the Speaker? My friend Sri V. S. Patil has raised a very valid point and referred to sub-rule (6) which says that "it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session."

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—What was really discussed in this House was the motion that Sri Peeranna should be elected as Deputy Speaker of this House.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—The Chief Minister says that this matter was not discussed and so he is entitled to move it. My submission is that the motion was moved by reason of the fact that the motion had been admitted by the Speaker and it had also been included in Agenda. Since the mover was not present at that time the motion lapsed. Therefore there is no question of reviving that motion again in the same session. It is only a technical point to say that it was not discusssed. It is only consistent with natural understanding that it should not be allowed to be moved again and there is no question of reviving it.

†Sri S. SHIVAPPA (Shravana belagola).—We must take the facts into consideration. On the day when it was put down in the agenda, there were two motions, one from the Congress side and the other from this side. Then we asked as to what happened to the first motion and nobody said whether we were going to adjourn the Consideration of that motion or not. Then we said that that motion should lapse. These are the facts. Sub-rule (6) of rule 148 says "it shall not revive discussion of a matter which has been discussed in the same session." The Chief Minister was pleased to say that no decision had been taken on that motion. This is only a technical point. The motion was before the House and it lapsed due to the mistake of the other side. I do not know why they committed that mistake. This is a clever move on the part of the ruling party to bring forward the same type of motion once again and by-pass the rules of this House. If the Congress Party persists that this motion should be moved in the House, I painfully submit that we on this side are not prepared to participate in this matter and we have to walk out. So I request the Speaker to take a firm stand on this issue and rule out this motion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದಿವಸ ಯಾವಾಗ ಮೊದಲನೇ ಉಮೇದುವಾರರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಸೂಚಕರು ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಆಗ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬ ಉಮೇದುವಾರರನ್ನು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಚುನಾಯಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾವರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ದಿವಸ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದನ್ನೇ ಇವೊತ್ತು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದಿವಸ ಮೋಷನ್ ಬಂದಿದ್ದು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಡಿಕ್ಲೇರ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಡಿಕ್ಲರೇಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆದಿವಸ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಡಿಫೀಟಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಈಗ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ

9-00 A.M.

Sri D. VENKATARAMAIAH (Robertsonpet).—Sir, on the day when the motion for election of the Deputy Speaker was inclnded in the agenda, a certain member had to move it. But that person did not move it and the Speaker did not announce that that motion was moved. The Speaker did not call the proposer to move it.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is a remark against the Chair that you have not done your duty.

Sri D. VENKATARAMAIAH.—Sir, I seek your protection to see that he will hear me patiently just as we on this side of the House hear him. As the motion is not moved, there is no question of lapse. If the motion had been moved and if it had been disallowed, then that question of bringing it again would have arisen. As such, there is no question of lapse. There is also no point of order at all.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—What the Hon'ble Member was saying was that when you called the motion, it was neither moved nor proposed. That only means that the House was not seized of the question that Sri Panchagavi be elected as the Deputy Speaker. The other motion which raised the question of election of Sri Peeranna as the Deputy Speaker was moved and voted down. Naturally, it cannot be raised again.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot allow this matter to be converted into a debate. If every member goes on participating, it becomes difficult. If Sri Venkatai Gowda has any new and fine point to make, he may do so. If it is going to be a repetition, I will request him not to speak.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—You may kindly see the proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER.—More than one member has invited my attention to the proceedings.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—It is being said that the Speaker did not call the mover to move the motion. We object to it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members are entitled to make such a representation as they think fit provided it is relevant. One member said that I should look into the proceedings. If another member says that I should not look into them, it does not mean that I am not going to look into them. You must leave it to me.

†Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—Sir, the Leader of the House has already clarified the position. The Leader of the Opposition said that they were not going to participate in the debate if the motion was moved or they would walk out. I appeal to him that it is not proper on his part to take such an attitude. That means, indirectly they want to coerce the Chair to give a particular decision in their favour. When once a decision is given by the Chair, we have to abide by it. Before a decision is given we have of course every right to put forth our views But I cannot understand when the Leader of the Opposition says that even before a decision is given, unless the decision is given in such and such a manner, they are not going to participate. That attitude is not good, I should say.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—The Speaker should not yield to the brute majority of the Congress.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS.—Rule 271 is clear on this point. No decision has been taken on this matter. The decision that was taken was that so and so could not be the Deputy Speaker. There was no decision taken whether Sri Panchagavi should be elected as the Deputy Speaker or not. Now, it is for the Chair to allow this motion.

With regard to the lapse of the motion, it is again for the Chair to decide. The Chair can permit and this motion can be moved.

Sri V S. PATIL.—The Hon'ble Leader of the House said that that motion had not been moved and that it had not been decided. He thoroughly knows that the question of election of the Deputy Speaker was before this House. It had been put to the House and decided. A decision has been taken by this House. When you are elected as the Speaker, can we bring another motion to the effect that the Speaker should be so and so ? It cannot be moved at all.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—On a point of order, Sir.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—How can there be a second point of order when there is already a point of order ?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The question of election of the Speaker has been disposed of permanently by this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must confess that on this matter I have already bestowed a good deal of thought before I admitted it and it has been thoroughly and elaborately discussed. What has now been said after perhaps a few minutes is but a repetition of what has already been said. Because the Hon'ble Member Sri Patil is on his legs, I will allow him two minutes and he connot make a long speech. After that, I propose to give my ruling.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—This matter was substantially before the House. The House has discussed it and a decision has been arrived at. The matter is the same namely the election of the Deputy Speaker and not the question of election of X or Y or Z. So, I submit that the same subject cannot be taken up again before this House. It is not the question of election of the Leader of the House by the Ruling Party. They can change it at any time. But, here we are bound by the procedure and the Rules. This particular motion regarding the election of the Deputy Speaker has lapsed automatically. There is no question of your giving any ruling. I submit that this question cannot be discussed in this Assembly at all.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not going to allow any further discussion on this point. The matter is extremely simple. It has been made complicated by certain wrong premises that have been adopted. When the matter came up on the last occasion and the motion was to be moved, the Hon'ble Member Sri Suryanarayana Rao who was to move was not there. Therefore, the motion was not moved. The facts are that a certain item was set down in the Agenda for transacting business, namely, 'election of Deputy Speaker'. Now, the provision for the Office of Deputy Speaker is found in article 178 of the Constitution and it provides that there should be elections as many times as there are vacancies arising or so often as the office of Speaker or Deputy Speaker becomes vacant, the Assembly shall choose another member to be Speaker or Deputy Speaker, so that under the Constitution the duty is cast upon this Assembly to choose a Deputy Speaker. I do not know whether the House can resolve by saying that they do not want a Deputy Speaker. Such a position has not arisen. But anyhow till it directly arises before me, I do not propose to say anything on the point. But the position here is this on the day when the Hon'ble Member Sri Suryanarayana Rao was not there and the motion was also not moved, it was suggested by the Hon'ble member Sri Krishniah Setty that it was the duty of the Speaker to declare the other person elected and I told him as to why this new point flashed or dawned upon him to-day and why he did not mention it the other day and his reply was, that he thought that an experienced person like me in the Chair would have done it. That is certainly not fair; if he did not think of it, he must say 'I did not think of it' and not put blame on somebody else because if he is entitled to forget, every member including the Speaker also is entitled to forget, but I must say that I did not forget it because the fact was that a particular motion, not the basic motion of electing the Deputy Speaker, but that 'Mr. so and so to be elected as Deputy Speaker' and the motion to be moved by the particular Hon'ble Member who has given notice lapsed. The Hon'ble member Sri Patil was pleased to observe that the effect of the word 'lapse' according to him, was negativing the position. That means, the right to move that has effectually been lost. That is not quite correct, according to me. The legal effect is that I should not permit Sri Suryanarayana Rao to move that motion again if at all subject to other considerations. Now, the Hon'ble Member who is moving it or proposes to move it is not Sri Suryanarayana Rao. I do not understand the legal effect of 'lapse' to mean that the Assembly is prevented from considering a proposition to fill the post of the Deputy Speaker. The

legal effect of the word 'lapse' is to the extent that a particular member is prevented and no more. That does not encroach upon the right of other members to request the motion to be put on the agenda. That does not prevent the Speaker from admitting the same. If I had not admitted this, the position would have been that I would be asking or permitting or directing or giving a condition to the Assembly that it cannot be moved in this session at all. I have considered the position very well and my opinion is that the legal effect is limited to direct the Hon'ble Member who gave notice, namely, Sri Suryanarayana Rao, that he cannot move it. So far as the second resolution, that is, that the alternative proposal is concerned, I make no distinction between what was described by the Leader of the House, resolution or motion of the Congress Party and non-Congress Party. There is no question of party. Individual members are entitled to be proposed to be elected as Deputy Speaker. So, the other proposition, namely that the Hon'ble member Sri Peeranna be elected was voted upon and negatived. So, the legal effect is this : of the two resolutions that were before the House, one, that Sri Panchagavi be elected, lapsed and the other ' that Sri Peeranna be elected ' was negatived. In other words, the effect of the two is not the same. I cannot understand how the first resolution, namely, that Sri Panchagavi be elected is to be put on a par with the other resolution namely that Sri Peeranna be elected Deputy Speaker. Its legal effect is not the same because the latter has been negatived. Therefore, the rules that I referred to are certainly not in conflict with the opinion that I am holding. Rule 74 (2). says :

> "If a motion that the Bill be referred to a Joint or Select Committee is negatived or if no such motion is made, the Speaker may proceed to submit the Bill or any part of the Bill to the Assembly clause by clause under rule 86."

I do not think there is much efficacy in the argument as several members seem to be arguing. They may have their ower opinion about this matter but there is no need to express it loudly.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Minister for Home).—May I suggest one thing with your kind permission ? Even, article 178, the Speaker can resort to because there will still be a vacancy and that vacancy can be filled at any time irresspective of the 'lapse'.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is not the convention of the Members on this side. It cannot come up again in the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule 144 deals with the repetition of resolutions.

> "When a resolution has been moved and voted upon no resolution or amendment raising substantially the same question shall be moved within one year from the date of moving of the earlier resolution."

Limiting ourselves to the resolution, it contained that Sri Panchagavi be elected as Deputy Speaker. It has not been voted upon and therefore Rule 144 does not cover it. Rule 148 refers to conditions of admissibility of motions. In view of the statutory duty that is cast and in view of the provisions of article 178, rule 148 does not apply. Rule 149 refers to ' Speaker to decide admissibility of a motion.' I have already done it and I have been asked to revive it. If there is any error, I do not hesitate to refuse to admit the motion. I feel there is no error and I do not propose to do it. Then rule 271 says that a motion must not raise a question substantially identical with the one on which the Assembly has given a decision in the same session. So the distinction between the two, decision and legal effect of lapse is one that arises finally for consideration. Decision is taken after applying one's mind and having a chance to vote and accept it or reject it. This particular motion that Sri Panchagavi be elected as Deputy Speaker has not been decided upon. There is no decision. Therefore Rule 271 does not apply. Therefore I rule that this is in perfect order and we may proceed with it just now. Sri Tavare to move the motion.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—As a protest against the unyielding and stubborn nature of the party not to respect the wishes of the other Party we do not like to take part in this business and so we are staging a walk-out.

[*At this stage, Members of the Opposition withdrew from the House.*]

Election of Deputy Speaker

Sri F. S. TAVARE (Shiggaon).—I move :

"That Sri A. R. Panchagavi be elected as Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

Sri N. A. KARILINGANNAWAR (Gokak I).—I second the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Motion moved :

"That Sri A. R. Panchagavi be elected as Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Sri A. R. Panchagavi be elected as Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I request the Hon'ble Proposer and the Seconder to conduct Sri Panchagavi and instal him in his seat.

[*Sri A. R. Panchagavi was conducted to his seat, followed by the proposer and the seconder.*]

Mr. SPEAKER.—In view of the first motion being passed, the other motion lapses. We will proceed to the next item. Before the Chief Minister begins, I would like to invite his attention to rule 21(2).

MOTION OF THANKS TO THE GOVERNOR

Motion to postpone further discussion.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Chief Minister).—Sir, I move :

"That further discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the Governor be postponed till the Mysore University (Amendment) Bill, 1962, is considered and passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved ;

"That further discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the Governor be postponed till the Mysore University (Amendment) Bill, 1962, is considered and passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962

Motion to consider

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Chief Minister).—I beg to move :

"That the Mysore University (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore University (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, this is a very simple measure. In the original Act certain defects were noticed and therefore this amending Bill has been brought before the House to remedy some of the lapses and defects in the Act. Section 26 of the original Act gives powers to the Chancellor to appoint two members on the Board of Appointment. According to the amending Bill, the Chancellor shall have power to appoint one member and the Syndicate shall have the power to appoint another member. This has become necessary because the University felt that it had absolutely no voice on the Board of Appointment. It was considered necessary to give power to the Syndicate to appoint one person on the Board of Appointments. Section 26 of the original Act envisages that the Board shall consist of Vice Chancellor and two members nominated by the Chancellor, and they were obliged to consult the Head of the Department. The Head of the University Department was not a member of the Board itself. So, it was felt necessary that the Head of the University Department should also be a member of the Board instead of merely being a person who should be consulted by the Board. Therefore, necessary amendments are brought forward in clause 2 to amend section 26.